



## Verification/Completeness Check Responses

**Ex. 4 - CBI**

to:

Robin Costas

04/09/2012 02:11 PM

Cc:

Kelley Chase, Cynthia Caporale,

**Ex. 4 - CBI****Ex. 4 - CBI**

Hide Details

From:

**Ex. 4 - CBI**

@lmco.com&gt; Sort List...

To: Robin Costas/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA,  
John Gilbert/CI/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Newhart/CI/USEPA/US@EPA,**Ex. 4 - CBI**

A

**Ex. 4 - CBI**

@lmco.com&gt;

**Ex. 4 - CBI**

Robin,

I have two questions for you. The first refers to File 1202003 FINAL PART 3 of 3 R33907 03 14 12 1314.pdf (my status report SERAS-172-DSR-032112\_Dimock\_31). In Cindy's response to item #1 (her e-mail dated 4/6/12 ~2:33pm), she includes criteria for qualifying data based on field blanks. The qualifications that I proposed were based on the method blank that was elevated. For a previous package, we elevated the RL to the amount found in the method blank (20 mg/L) and then any concentration that was within 10 times that RL (20 to 200 mg/L), we flagged as estimated (J). I think that Cindy misread the sentence and thought the field blank was elevated. Can you check with R3 validation criteria to determine if this approach is acceptable?

The second question refers to File 1202005 FINAL PART 1 of 3 R33907 03 15 12 1429.pdf (my status report SERAS-172-DSR-032112\_32). In Cindy's response to item #1, she would like to raise the RL for copper to the amount found in FB18 (7.4 ug/L) from 2/15/12. On that day (2/15/12), samples HW07, HW07-F, FB18 and FB18-F were collected. I am assuming that the RL for only sample HW07 should be qualified since the other two were field filtered and FB18-F was clean at 2.0U. My rationale is that FB18 should be associated with HW07 and FB18-F should be associated with HW07-F.

Once we have these two questions answered, we should be good to go for Week 3. Thanks in advance for your help.

**Ex. 4 - CBI**

# Ex. 4 - CBI